



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/669,338	09/25/2003	Graeme McLintock	2001P05170WOUS	6607
28204 7590 11/14/2007 SIEMENS SCHWEIZ AG I-47, INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ALBISRIEDERSTRASSE 245 ZURICH, CH-8047 SWITZERLAND			EXAMINER STORK, KYLE R	
			ART UNIT 2178	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 11/14/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

mn

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/669,338	MCLINTOCK, GRAEME	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Kyle R. Stork	2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 September 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This non-final office action is in response to the application filed 25 September 2003.
2. Claims 1-22 are pending. Claim 1 is independent.

### ***Priority***

3. Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d).

### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

4. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 15 March 2004 is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

### ***Drawings***

5. The examiner accepts the drawings filed 25 September 2003.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

7. Claims 1-3, 5-6, 8, 10-13, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Van Den Berghe et al. (WO 00/31657, published 2 June 2000, hereafter Van Den Berghe).

As per independent claim 1, Van Den Berghe discloses a method for producing Internet information, wherein an end user unit generates one or more segments from an address of a downloaded web page as one or more attributes and stores the attributes in a web object (page 12, lines 6-38: Here, the proxy server generates pages by pulling merchant information into a web page (object) and pushing the web page to the user).

As per dependent claim 2, Van Den Berghe discloses wherein the downloaded web page in the end user unit produces further attributes and stores the further attributes in the web object (page 12, lines 6-15: Here, the APS feeds the proxy server user attributes, which are rerouted to each of the appropriate merchant sites).

As per dependent claim 3, Van Den Berghe discloses wherein, in addition to the attributes, the associated web pages or selected parts thereof are stored in the web object (page 12, lines 6-38).

As per dependent claim 5, Van Den Berghe discloses wherein a list of web pages previously visited in a same domain is entered as a further attribute for the web

page (page 12, lines 6-15: Here, the shopping cart records a history of merchant sites visited from which a user has purchased items).

As per dependent claim 6, Van Den Berghe discloses wherein an end user inputs into "input" fields on the web page are entered as further attributes for the web page (page 12, lines 6-38; page 13, lines 20-25: Here, a user profile (data) is inputted and entered at merchant sites when a user purchases items).

As per dependent claim 8, Van Den Berghe discloses wherein the segments from the addresses are chosen such that reliable means of access to the web pages are obtained (page 12, lines 19-38).

As per dependent claim 10, Van Den Berghe discloses wherein the one or more attributes are transmitted to one or more further Internet end users (page 13, lines 16-25; page 11, lines 6-38).

As per dependent claim 11, Van Den Berghe discloses wherein in addition to the attributes, the associated downloaded web page or the selected parts thereof are transmitted (page 12, lines 6-38: Here, portions of a merchant site, such as an item description, are added to the web page and pushed to the user).

As per dependent claim 12, Van Den Berghe discloses wherein the attributes are automatically generated from addresses by using respective address to search a configuration file and, if a segment of the address is found in the configuration file, by assigning this part as a sought attribute from the address of the web page (page 11, lines 6-38: Here, the merchant sites are searched for the item description. If the item description is found, it is added to the web page, and pushed to the user for display).

As per dependent claim 13, Van Den Berghe discloses wherein the configuration file contains attribute templates, comprising text patterns and appropriate attribute names (page 11, lines 6-38).

As per dependent claim 22, Van Den Berghe discloses wherein transmission is effected via a web server using HTTP (page 11, lines 6-38).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 15 and 17-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Den Berghe.

As per dependent claim 15, Van Den Berghe discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 1. Van Den Berghe discloses combining a plurality of web objects to form a web page (page 11, lines 6-38). Van Den Berghe fails to disclose the creation of a web packet. However, it was notoriously well known in the art at the time of the applicant's invention that a web packet is a formatted grouping of data transmitted via a network. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined web packets with Van Den Berghe, thereby allowing for the web objects to be sent over a network.

As per dependent claim 16, Van Den Berghe discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 15, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Van Den Berghe fails to specifically disclose wherein the web packet is combined with the associated additional attributes to form a packet file. However, Van Den Berghe discloses storing additional attributes in the web object (page 12, lines 6-38). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined the web object containing the additional attributes into web packets, thereby creating a packet file. This would have been beneficial since it would have allowed a user to incorporate all relevant information into a single file for transmission to a user.

As per dependent claim 17, Van Den Berghe discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 15, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Van Den Berghe fails to specifically disclose wherein the web packet is combined with the associated additional attributes to form a packet file. However, Van Den Berghe discloses storing additional attributes in the web object (page 12, lines 6-38). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined the web object containing the additional attributes into web packets, thereby creating a packet file. This would have been beneficial since it would have allowed a user to incorporate all relevant information into a single file for transmission to a user.

As per dependent claim 18, Van Den Berghe discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 17, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Van Den Berghe discloses transmitting web pages to a user in whole or parts to end users (page 11, lines 6-38). Van Den Berghe fails to specifically disclose transmitting a packet file.

However, It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined the web object containing the additional attributes into web packets, thereby creating a packet file. This would have been beneficial since it would have allowed a user to incorporate all relevant information into a single file for transmission to a user.

As per dependent claim 19, Van Den Berghe discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Van Den Berghe fails to specifically disclose processing and displaying attributes to an end user. However, it was notoriously well known in the art at the time of the applicant's invention that data may be processed (parsed) and displayed to a user via a web browser. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined a user's web browser for displaying data with Van Den Berghe, thereby allowing a user to view the pages generated and pushed by the server.

As per dependent claim 20, Van Den Berghe discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 19, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Van Den Berghe fails to specifically disclose use of a plug-in. However, it was notoriously well known in the art at the time of the applicant's invention that a plug-in may be used in order to extend the normal operation of a web browser. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined a plug-in with Van Den Berghe, since it would have allowed a user to extend the processing of a browser to include displaying the generated pages.



As per dependent claim 21, Van Den Berghe discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 20, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Van Den Berghe discloses transmitting data (page 11, lines 6-38). However, Van Den Berghe fails to disclose the transmission medium being e-mail. However, it was notoriously well known in the art at the time of the applicant's invention that data may be transmitted via e-mail, thereby allowing for data to be sent to only specified users. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined e-mail with Van Den Berghe, since it would have allowed a user to specify recipients of the data.

10. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Den Berghe and further in view of Tremblay et al. (US 2003/0172316, filed 6 March 2002, hereafter Tremblay).

As per dependent claim 4, Van Den Berghe discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 2, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Van Den Berghe fails to specifically disclose wherein the date and time when the web page is downloaded are entered. Tremblay discloses storing the date and time when the web page is downloaded (paragraph 0040). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Tremblay with Van Den Berghe, since it would have allowed a user to easily determine the age of the web page.

11. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Den Berghe and further in view of Koskas (US 2002/0095421, filed 13 December 2000).

As per dependent claim 7, Van Den Bergh discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 2, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Van Den Bergh fails to specifically disclose wherein segments from addresses for links in the web page are entered as further attributes. However, Koskas discloses wherein segments from addresses for links in the web page are entered as further attributes (paragraph 0132). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Koskas with Van Den Berghe, since it would have allowed a user to maintain a list of links contained with the web page.

12. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Den Berghe and further in view of Oberwager et al. (US 6510430, filed 24 February 1999, hereafter Oberwager).

As per dependent claim 9, Van Den Berghe discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 2, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Van Den Berghe fails to specifically disclose obtaining remarks text. However, Oberwager discloses obtaining remarks text (column 9, lines 54-65). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Oberwager with Van Den Berghe, since it would have allowed a user to store reviews of items displayed within the webpage.

13. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Den Berghe and further in view of Murren et al. (US 2004/0205525, filed 30 April 2001, hereafter Murren).

As per dependent claim 14, Van Den Berghe discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 13, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Van Den Berghe fails to specifically disclose wherein the segments are stored as named attributes. However, Murren discloses storing the attributes as name-value pairs (paragraphs 0122-0127). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Murren with Van Den Berghe, since it would have allowed a user to associate both the attributes and their values together.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kyle R. Stork whose telephone number is (571) 272-4130. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (8:00-4:30).


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2178

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Kyle R Stork  
Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 2178

krs



STEPHEN HONG  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER